

Questions & Answers
BILL KIRCH MOTORS INC
330 N SHAWANO ST NEW LONDON WI
Comm Number: 54961-1150-30-A
BRRTS Number: 03-69-179660

Q: THE SITE INVESTIGATION REPORT, FISCHER INDICATES THAT SITE INVESTIGATION ACTIVITIES PERFORMED ON THE PROPERTY WEST OF SHAWANO STREET WERE USED TO DETERMINE WESTERLY GROUNDWATER FLOW. HOWEVER GROUNDWATER FLOW AT THIS SITE APPEARS TO BE SOUTH. IS THERE GROUNDWATER ELEVATION DATA AVAILABLE TO RECONCILE THIS DIFFERENCE?

A: All the data available from the site across the street (Ebben's Towing & Auto COMM #54961-1149-33) indicates a southwesterly groundwater flow. That file is available for review at the Commerce Oshkosh office. I would believe that the elevations of the Wolf and Embarrass Rivers would influence the direction of groundwater flow to some degree.

Q: NO SOIL BORINGS WERE ADVANCE WEST OF B-2 AND B-3 YET THESE BORINGS HAD SIGNIFICANT SOIL CONTAMINATION. FURTHERMORE, THE SIR INDICATES THAT GROUNDWATER FLOW AT THE SITE ACROSS THE STREET HAD WESTERLY GROUNDWATER FLOW. IS THERE ANY DATA TO SUGGEST WHETHER THE SOIL OR GROUNDWATER PLUMES EXTEND WEST UNDER OR ACROSS SHAWNO STREET? AND IF SOIL AND/OR GROUNDWATER CONTAMINATION EXISTS UNDER OR WEST OF SHAWNO STREET WOULD THAT REPRESENT A CHANGED CONDITION?

A: There is a monitoring well (Ebben's Towing & Auto Site - MW-3) approximately 90 feet due west of MW-2. That well is clean. I am convinced there is contamination beneath the road; therefore I wouldn't see that as a changed condition. If a consulting firm is going to leave a great deal of contamination on site and rely on a monitoring network to demonstrate natural attenuation, then a monitoring well may be required across the road, west of MW-9. If contamination were discovered over there, then I would consider that a changed condition.

Q: OUR ANALYSIS OF THE SITE SUGGESTS THAT SIGNIFICANTLY MORE THAN 500 TONS OF SOIL WILL NEED TO BE REMOVED TO ADDRESS ALL OF THE SOILS WITH NR 746 TABLE 2 EXCEEDENCES. HOW WILL THE WORKPLANS BE ASSESSED TO DETERMINE IF THE PROPOSED RAP AND ASSOCIATED COSTS WILL BE SUFFICIENT TO BRING THE SITE TO CLOSURE.

A: All soil that exceeds both Table 1 and Table 2 will need to be addressed in some way, but not necessarily removed. Commerce will not even consider an action using excavation as the sole remedy, unless the excavation is a minimum of 500 tons. That doesn't mean that the removal of 500 tons takes care of addressing all the soil contamination. For Commerce to evaluate each bid, the bidder must use the code to present a clear path to closure for their proposed remedial action.

Q: THERE WAS AT LEAST ONE NON-PECFA ELIGIBLE TANK AT THE SITE, AND AT THE TIME OF REMOVAL SOIL CONTAMINATION WAS DISCOVERED IN THAT TANKS BASIN; HOWEVER, THERE IS NO CONCLUSIVE EVIDENCE THAT THIS TANK CONTRIBUTED TO THE CONTAMINATION ON SITE. IS THE ENTIRE PLUME CONSIDERED PECFA ELIGIBLE?

A: You are bidding on the lowest cost to bring the eligible tanks to closure. I do not anticipate any work being required beyond that. If specific work would be required to accommodate the ineligible tank, then that work would not be eligible.

Q: BORINGS B-2 AND B-3 INDICATE THAT THERE IS SIGNIFICANT CONTAMINATION NEAR A GAS LINE YET NO UTILITY CORRIDOR INVESTIGATION WAS PERFORMED. IS A UTILITY CORRIDOR INVESTIGATION CONSIDERED A NECESSARY PART OF THE REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN?

A: Contaminant migration in the utility corridor will need to be addressed in order to get closure at this site.